

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- x  
IBRAHIM ALMAHSHI,

Plaintiff,

-against-

CITY OF NEW YORK; POLICE OFFICER  
FRANKIE IGLESIAS and JOHN and JANE  
DOE 1 through 10, individually and in their official  
capacities (the names John and Jane Doe being  
fictitious, as the true names are presently unknown),

Defendants.  
----- x

**FIRST AMENDED  
COMPLAINT**

Jury Trial Demanded

13-CV-6832 (CBA)(MDG)

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This is an action to recover money damages arising out of the violation of plaintiff's rights under the Constitution.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. This action is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, and the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

3. The jurisdiction of this Court is predicated upon 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343 and 1367(a).

4. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 (b) and (c).

5. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the New York State claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

**JURY DEMAND**

6. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury in this action.

**PARTIES**

7. Plaintiff IBRAHIM ALMAHSHI (“plaintiff” or “Mr. ALMAHSHI”) is a resident of Kings County in the City and State of New York.

8. Defendant City of New York is a municipal corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York. It operates the NYPD, a department or agency of defendant City of New York responsible for the appointment, training, supervision, promotion and discipline of police officers and supervisory police officers, including the individually named defendants herein.

9. Police Officer FRANKIE INGLESIAS (“INGLESIAS”) is a member of the New York City Police Department who was acting under color of state law and in his capacity as a City law enforcement officer at all relevant times.

10. At all times relevant defendants John and Jane Doe 1 through 10 were police officers, detectives or supervisors employed by the NYPD. Plaintiff does not know the real names and shield numbers of defendants John and Jane Doe 1 through 10.

11. At all times relevant herein, defendants John and Jane Doe 1 through 10 were acting as agents, servants and employees of defendant City of New York and the

NYPD. Defendants John and Jane Doe 1 through 10 are sued in their individual and official capacities.

12. At all times relevant herein, all individual defendants were acting under color of state law.

### **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

13. On August 10, 2013, on or about 3:30 a.m., plaintiff was lawfully present in the vicinity of Union Avenue and North 11<sup>th</sup> Street in Brooklyn.

14. Plaintiff lawfully worked as a driver for a car service.

15. While driving his client to her destination, plaintiff's car was blocked by a vehicle that was stopped in the middle of the road.

16. Plaintiff later learned that this vehicle was an unmarked police car.

17. Plaintiff waited for several minutes and lightly honked his horn.

18. Two New York City Police Officers, including IGLESIAS, then got into the car and moved it so that plaintiff's car could pass.

19. The officers then followed plaintiff in their vehicle for several blocks.

20. Despite the fact that they had no probable cause to believe that he had committed any crimes or offenses, the officers stopped plaintiff's vehicle.

21. The officers forced the car's passenger to leave and demanded to see plaintiff's identification and registration.

22. Plaintiff provided his license to the officers and was looking for his registration. As he did so, he informed the officers that he suffered from a serious heart condition.

23. The officers then pulled plaintiff out of the car and placed him into handcuffs.

24. Plaintiff began to experience heart palpitations and begged for an ambulance.

25. An ambulance arrived and transported plaintiff to Woodhull Hospital for treatment. At the hospital he was handcuffed to his bed.

26. Plaintiff was subsequently arraigned and all charges against him were adjourned in contemplation of dismissal.

27. Within ninety days after the claim alleged in this Complaint arose, a written notice of claim was served upon defendants at the Comptroller's Office.

28. At least thirty days have elapsed since the service of the notice of claim, and adjustment or payment of the claim has been neglected or refused.

29. This action has been commenced within one year and ninety days after the happening of the events upon which the claims are based.

30. Plaintiff suffered damage as a result of defendants' actions. Plaintiff was deprived of his liberty, suffered emotional distress, mental anguish, fear, pain, bodily injury, anxiety, embarrassment, humiliation, and damage to his reputation.

**FIRST CLAIM**  
**Unlawful Stop and Search**

31. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

32. Defendants violated the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments because they stopped and searched plaintiff without reasonable suspicion.

33. As a direct and proximate result of this unlawful conduct, plaintiff sustained the damages herein before alleged.

**SECOND CLAIM**  
**False Arrest**

34. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

35. Defendants violated the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments because they arrested plaintiff without probable cause.

36. As a direct and proximate result of this unlawful conduct, Plaintiff sustained the damages hereinbefore alleged.

**THIRD CLAIM**  
**State Law False Imprisonment and False Arrest**

37. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

38. By their conduct, as described herein, the individual defendants are liable to plaintiff for falsely imprisoning and falsely arresting plaintiff.

39. Plaintiff was conscious of his confinement.

40. Plaintiff did not consent to his confinement.

41. Plaintiff's confinement was not otherwise privileged.

42. Defendant City of New York, as an employer of the individual defendant officers, is responsible for their wrongdoing under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*.

43. As a direct and proximate result of the misconduct and abuse of authority stated above, plaintiff sustained the damages alleged herein.

**FOURTH CLAIM**  
**Unreasonable Force**

44. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

45. The defendants violated the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments because they used unreasonable force on plaintiff.

46. As a direct and proximate result of this unlawful conduct, plaintiff sustained the damages hereinbefore alleged.

**FIFTH CLAIM**

**State Law Assault and Battery**

47. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

48. By their conduct, as described herein, the defendants are liable to plaintiff for having assaulted and battered him.

49. Defendant City of New York, as an employer of the individual defendant officers, is responsible for their wrongdoing under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*.

50. As a direct and proximate result of the misconduct and abuse of authority stated above, plaintiff sustained the damages alleged herein.

**SIXTH CLAIM**

**Denial Of Constitutional Right To Fair Trial**

51. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

52. The individual defendants created false evidence against Plaintiff.

53. The individual defendants forwarded false evidence to prosecutors in the Kings County District Attorney's office.

54. In creating false evidence against Plaintiff, and in forwarding false information to prosecutors, the individual defendants violated Plaintiff's

constitutional right to a fair trial under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution.

55. As a direct and proximate result of this unlawful conduct, Plaintiff sustained the damages hereinbefore alleged.

### **SEVENTH CLAIM**

#### **Malicious Abuse Of Process**

56. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

57. The individual defendants issued legal process to place Plaintiff under arrest.

58. The individual defendants arrested Plaintiff in order to obtain collateral objectives outside the legitimate ends of the legal process, to wit, to cover up their assault of him.

59. The individual defendants acted with intent to do harm to Plaintiff without excuse or justification.

60. As a direct and proximate result of this unlawful conduct, Plaintiff sustained the damages hereinbefore alleged.



**ELEVENTH CLAIM**  
**Negligent Hiring/Training/Retention**

61. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

62. Defendant City, through the NYPD, owed a duty of care to plaintiff to prevent the conduct alleged, because under the same or similar circumstances a reasonable, prudent, and careful person should have anticipated that injury to plaintiff or to those in a like situation would probably result from the foregoing conduct.

63. Upon information and belief, all of the individual defendants were unfit and incompetent for their positions.

64. Upon information and belief, defendant City knew or should have known through the exercise of reasonable diligence that the individual defendants were potentially dangerous.

65. Upon information and belief, defendant City's negligence in screening, hiring, training, disciplining, and retaining these defendants proximately caused each of plaintiff's injuries.

66. As a direct and proximate result of this unlawful conduct, plaintiff sustained the damages hereinbefore alleged.

### **NINTH CLAIM**

#### **Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress**

67. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

68. By reason of the foregoing, and by assaulting, battering, and using gratuitous, excessive, brutal, sadistic, and unconscionable force, failing to prevent other defendants from doing so, or causing an unlawful seizure and extended detention without due process, the defendants, acting in their capacities as NYPD officers, and within the scope of their employment, each committed conduct so extreme and outrageous as to constitute the intentional infliction of emotional distress upon Plaintiff.

69. The intentional infliction of emotional distress by these defendants was unnecessary and unwarranted in the performance of their duties as NYPD officers.

70. Defendants, their officers, agents, servants, and employees were responsible for the intentional infliction of emotional distress upon Plaintiff. Defendant City, as employer of each of the defendants, is responsible for their wrongdoings under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*.

71. As a direct and proximate result of the misconduct and abuse of authority detailed above, Plaintiff sustained the damages hereinbefore alleged.

**TENTH CLAIM**

**Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress**

72. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

73. By reason of the foregoing, and by assaulting, battering, and using gratuitous, excessive, brutal, sadistic, and unconscionable force, failing to prevent other defendants from doing so, or causing an unlawful seizure and extended detention without due process, the defendants, acting in their capacities as NYPD officers, and within the scope of their employment, each were negligent in committing conduct that inflicted emotional distress upon Plaintiff.

74. The negligent infliction of emotional distress by these defendants was unnecessary and unwarranted in the performance of their duties as NYPD officers.

75. Defendants, their officers, agents, servants, and employees were responsible for the negligent infliction of emotional distress upon Plaintiff. Defendant City, as employer of each of the defendants, is responsible for their wrongdoings under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*.

76. As a direct and proximate result of the misconduct and abuse of authority detailed above, Plaintiff sustained the damages hereinbefore alleged.

**ELEVENTH CLAIM**  
**Deliberate Indifference to Safety/Medical Needs**

77. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

78. The individual defendants were aware of a risk to plaintiff's safety and a need for medical care and failed to act in deliberate indifference to plaintiff's needs.

79. Accordingly, defendants violated the fourteenth amendment because they acted with deliberate indifference to plaintiff's medical needs and safety.

80. As a direct and proximate result of this unlawful conduct, Plaintiff sustained the damages hereinbefore alleged.

**TWELFTH CLAIM**  
**Failure To Intervene**

81. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation as if fully set forth herein.

82. Those defendants that were present but did not actively participate in the aforementioned unlawful conduct observed such conduct, had an opportunity prevent such conduct, had a duty to intervene and prevent such conduct and failed to intervene.

83. Accordingly, the defendants who failed to intervene violated the First, Fourth, Fifth And Fourteenth Amendments.

84. As a direct and proximate result of this unlawful conduct, Plaintiff sustained the damages hereinbefore alleged.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, plaintiff respectfully requests judgment against defendants as follows:

- (a) Compensatory damages against all defendants, jointly and severally;
- (b) Punitive damages against the individual defendants, jointly and severally;
- (c) Reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1988; and
- (d) Such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

DATED: May 1, 2014  
New York, New York

\_\_\_\_\_  
/ss/  
Robert Marinelli  
Katherine E. Smith  
299 Broadway, 15th Floor  
New York, New York 10007  
(212) 822-1427

*Attorneys for plaintiff*